

DF

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

07-CR-363 (TCP)

-against-

**MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER**

KRISTIN FROELICH,

Defendant.

-----X  
PLATT, District Judge.

Before the Court is defendant Kristin Froelich's letter motion requesting early termination of her probation. In support of her request, defendant argues that besides her involvement in the instant criminal offense, she has no prior or subsequent criminal history. Defendant also notes that her case has been downgraded by the probation department to "Low Activity Caseload" status. Defendant also claims that she has been an upstanding citizen who has had the same job for almost eight years and has volunteered for Habitat for Humanity.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3564(c), a court, after considering the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. 3553(a), may "terminate a term of probation previously ordered and discharge the defendant . . . if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant and the interest of justice."

District courts in the Second Circuit have held that early termination of probation is warranted only in extraordinary circumstances. *See United States v. Trans*, No. 06-CV-862, 2009 WL 3460723, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. Oct.

23, 2009) (denying motion for early termination and noting that compliance with probation conditions is to be expected and insufficient to warrant a reduction); *United States v. Bailin*, No. 05-CR-048, 2008 WL 4279521, at \* 1 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 18, 2008) (noting that early termination of probation is warranted only occasionally and that “[f]ull compliance with the terms of probation, though laudable, does not constitute the type of exceptional behavior entitling a defendant to early termination”); *United States v. Wachsman*, No. 04-CR-902, 2008 WL 5042842, at \*1 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 25, 2008) (noting defendant’s post sentencing significant contributions to society but denying application for early termination as not being in the interests of justice). Moreover, defendant’s probation officer has advised the Court of that department’s policy against early termination.

Having considered the relevant factors as well as probation’s policy against early termination, the undersigned is satisfied that the interests of justice will not be served by terminating defendant’s probation before she has served her sentence. Accordingly, defendant’s request for early termination of probation is hereby **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: April 27, 2011  
Central Islip, New York

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas C. Platt, U.S.D.J.